

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
DAVID LOUIME,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

- against -

No. 23-CV-6898 (CS)

ANTHONY ANNUCCI, et al.,

Defendants.

-----X
This Order relates to:

Louime v. Annucci, et al., No. 23-CV-6898

Campbell v. Annucci, et al., No. 23-CV-6900

Brooks v. Annucci, et al., No. 23-CV-6902

Roque v. Annucci, et al., No. 23-CV-6906

Scott v. Annucci, et al., No. 23-CV-6911

Reed v. Annucci, et al., No. 23-CV-6918

Haymon v. Annucci, et al., No. 23-CV-6922

Seibel, J.

Plaintiffs in each of the above-captioned cases filed motions requesting *pro bono* counsel.

The factors to be considered in ruling on an indigent litigant's request for counsel include the merits of the case, their efforts to obtain a lawyer, and their ability to gather the facts and present the case if unassisted by counsel. *See Cooper v. A. Sargent Co.*, 877 F.2d 170, 172 (2d Cir. 1989); *Hedges v. Police Officers*, 802 F.2d 58, 60-62 (2d Cir. 1986). Of these factors, the merits are “[t]he factor which command[s] the most attention.” *Cooper*, 877 F.2d at 172. Because it is too early for the Court to assess the merits in all of the above-captioned cases, Plaintiffs' motions for counsel are denied without prejudice to renewal at a later date. The Clerk of Court is

respectfully directed to terminate those pending motions in each of the above-captioned cases and to docket this Order in each of the above-captioned cases.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 23, 2024
White Plains, New York

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cathy Seibel". The signature is fluid and cursive, with "Cathy" on the top line and "Seibel" on the bottom line, both written in a single continuous stroke.

CATHY SEIBEL, U.S.D.J.